

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated July 1, 2005. Claims 4-7, 18-27, 29-33 and 36-39 are pending.

Formality Objections

Claims 6, 7 and 21 stand objected to for formality reasons on page 2 of the Office Action. These objections have been addressed and resolved.

With respect to claims 6 and 21, Fig. 1 of the instant application illustrates, for example and without limitation, that the end of a second protective film 4 (at the top of Fig. 1) closer to the terminal portion (see terminal portion proximate 3) is farther away from an end of insulating substrate 1 where the terminal portion is provided than an end of first protective film 4 (at the bottom of Fig. 1) closer to the terminal portion. In order to clarify claims 6 and 21 and address the question raised by the Examiner, claims 6 and 21 have been amended to state that “an end of the second insulative protecting film closer to the terminal portion, *the second insulative protecting film being provided on a side of the substrate opposite the terminal portion*, is farther away from” The addition of this italicized language clarifies the meaning of these claims and overcomes the formality objection.

With respect to claim 7, the claim states “a boundary portion between (a) one of the first insulative wiring board and the second insulative wiring board which is provided on the surface the terminal portion is provided and (b) the terminal portion is distanced by at least 0.2 mm from an end of a substrate of the external electrical component which is connected to the terminal portion.” The Examiner states that “it is unclear what the first and second wiring board and thus what exactly is the boundary.” The instant specification at page 26, line 18 to page 27, line 12, states that, *inter alia*, “it is preferable that the boundary portion 17 between the plated layer 13

and the insulative protecting film 14 on the side of the base polymer film where the plated layer 13 is provided is distanced by at least 0.2 mm from the end of the glass substrate 21 to be connected to the plated layer 13 of the base polymer film 11.” Thus, the boundary portion 17 is distanced by at least 0.2 mm from the edge of the glass substrate. The claim, when viewed in light of the specification, is clear. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 7 is clear and not unclear.

Art Rejections

Claims 4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Ceresa. These Section 102(b) rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claims 4 and 6 as amended require that (1) the substrate, wirings, and protective films are “bent” [for example support, see Figs. 2-4 of the instant application], and (2) the terminal portion is at an “end” of the substrate. Ceresa fails to disclose or suggest each of these features of amended claims 4 and 6.

The Office Action appears to contend that Ceresa in Fig. 3 discloses elastic body 20 alleged to be a flexible substrate, first wiring 24, 26 on one side of the substrate 20, second wiring 24, 26 on the other side of the substrate 20, an insulating protective film 34 provided over the wirings on each side of the substrate 20, wherein protective film 34 is thinner than substrate 20. However, in directly contrast with amended claims 4 and 6, Ceresa *fails* to disclose or suggest both: (1) that the substrate, wirings, and protective films are “bent” as required by claims 4 and 6, and (2) that the terminal portion is at an “end” of the substrate as required by claims 4 and 6. Ceresa is entirely unrelated to the inventions of claims 4 and 6 in each of these respects.

Claims 18, 19, 21, 22 and 23 require that (1) the substrate, wirings, and protective films are “bent”, and (2) the terminal portion is at an “end portion” of the substrate. Ceresa fails to disclose or suggest each of these features of these claims. Citation to other art cannot cure these flaws in Ceresa.

Claim 7 requires “a boundary portion between (a) one of the first insulative wiring board and the second insulative wiring board which is provided on the surface the terminal portion is provided and (b) the terminal portion is distanced by at least 0.2 mm from an end of a substrate of the external electrical component which is connected to the terminal portion.” For purposes of example and without limitation, the instant specification at page 26, line 18 to page 27, line 12, states that, *inter alia*, “it is preferable that the boundary portion 17 between the plated layer 13 and the insulative protecting film 14 on the side of the base polymer film where the plated layer 13 is provided is distanced by at least 0.2 mm from the end of the glass substrate 21 to be connected to the plated layer 13 of the base polymer film 11.” With such an arrangement, the stress on the connected portion of the flexible wiring board 10 and the glass substrate 21 when bending the flexible wiring board 10 can be relieved to prevent or reduce wire breakage, thus improving reliability of the electrical connection at the connected portion. Further, it is possible to prevent or reduce flexibility from suffering and to reduce stress on the connected portion, which may be caused by the insulating protective film 14 laid over the chamfered portion of the glass substrate 21 when bent. That is, the boundary portion 17 may be distanced by at least 0.2 mm from the edge of the glass substrate. It is respectfully submitted that the cited art fails to disclose or suggest the aforesaid quoted features of claim 7.

KAWAI et al.
Appl. No. 09/712,227
November 1, 2005,

It is respectfully requested that all rejections be withdrawn. All claims are in condition for allowance. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with regard to the same.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYTE P.C.

By: 

Joseph A. Rhoa
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100